

Remarks

Claims 11-16 and 18 remain pending in this application after entry of this paper.

In the Advisory Action, the Examiner suggested to further define a traditional television program and a traditional television program signal to overcome the art of record. Applicants have amended independent claims 11 and 18 to more particularly point out the invention.

The claims now recite that the head end receives a traditional television program live broadcast signal for broadcast distribution to the end users. A stream derived from the traditional television program live broadcast signal originates from a user select playback point in the buffered storage queue. The traditional television live broadcast signal is distributed to the user. User selection of the playback point allows the user to manipulate an otherwise traditional television program live broadcast signal.

The various teachings relied on by the Examiner are not used for manipulating traditional program live broadcast signals as recited in the amended claims, but are only used for video on demand applications. There is no suggestion to combine the teachings of the art of record to achieve the claimed invention.

In Atalla, traditional television program broadcasting is indicated at network program gateway 100 and network programs 102. As explained by Atalla, network program gateway 100 switches any real time video program, such as a network broadcast program, directly to a user without involving the interactive video on demand system. This is in contrast to the claimed invention where the user manipulates an otherwise traditional television program live broadcast signal. On the other hand, Huizer describes pause and resume commands and relates to the reception of MPEG encoded television signals from a VOD server. Thus, Huizer also describes approaches used for video on demand applications and does not suggest the claimed manipulation of an otherwise traditional television program live broadcast signal.

The claims have been amended to particularly point out the manipulation of a traditional television program live broadcast signal (as opposed to only a video on demand system). The claims are believed to be patentable. Applicants also note that the Examiner has given much attention to the term "traditional," and respectfully direct the Examiner's attention to the fact that the relied upon VOD systems do not involve a "live broadcast signal" as now recited in the claims.

A check in the amount of \$1,240.00 is enclosed to cover the Petition fee of **\$450.00** and the RCE fee **\$790.00**. Please charge any additional fees or credit any overpayments as a result of the filing of this paper to our Deposit Account No. 02-3978.

Respectfully submitted,
LEE G. LAWRENCE ET AL.

By Jeremy J. Curran
Jeremy J. Curran
Reg. No. 42,454
Attorney for Applicant

Date: August 22, 2005

BROOKS KUSHMAN P.C.
1000 Town Center, 22nd Floor
Southfield, MI 48075-1238
Phone: 248-358-4400
Fax: 248-358-3351